

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 16-32 are pending in this application. The Examiner is thanked for indicating claims 6 and 9-32 allowed.

Claims 5, 10-14 and 16-18 have been amended to place them in independent form. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **March 22, 2004**. In view of the claims as amended and the remarks set forth below, further and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

I. Claims 1-4, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 7-53875. (Office Action Paragraph No. 2)

In view of the following, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The reference JP 7-53865 discloses a reflector including “polyphenylene sulfide (PPS).” The PPS and PPO respectively have an aromatic ring, but do not have an alicyclic structure.

On the other hand, the resin of present claims 1-4 and 9 is selected from the group consisting of “a ring-opening polymer of a norbornene-based monomer,” “a ring-opening polymer hydrogenate of a norbornene-based monomer,” “an addition polymer of a norbornene-based monomer,” “an addition polymer of a norbornene-based monomer and vinyl compound,” and “a vinyl alicyclic hydrocarbon polymer.” All of the resins encompassed by present claims 1-4 and 9, have an alicyclic structure.

The term "alicyclic structure" means a ring structure not having aromatic properties.

Therefore, the chemical structure of claims 1-4 and 9 and is different from that disclosed in the reference.

In support of the foregoing, submitted herewith please find an English translation of JP7-53865. As can be seen from the translation, the chemical structure of the reflector is different from the structure presently claimed in claims 1-4 and 9, as discussed above.

In view of the above, it is submitted that nothing in JP 7-53875 renders the claimed invention obvious within the meaning of 35 USC §103. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

II. Claims 5, 10-14, 16-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating claims 5, 10-14 and 16-18 allowable.

Accordingly, claims 5, 10-14 and 16-18 have been amended to place them in independent form including all of the limitations of any intervening base claims.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Susanne M. Hopkins
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,247

SMH/alw
Atty. Docket No. 001046
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE